

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

H

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,007	04/08/2004	William B. Weishar	100121.90138 9319		
<sup>26710</sup> QUARLES & F	7590 03/23/200 BRADY LLP	EXAMINER			
411 E. WISCO	NSIN AVENUE	JOHNSON, BLAIR M			
SUITE 2040 MILWAUKEE	, WI 53202-4497		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3634		
	<u> </u>		<b>-</b>		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	03/23/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/821,007	WEISHAR ET AL	WEISHAR ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
			Blair M. Johnson	3634				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appe	ears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence ac	idress			
WHI( - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINIORS of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DA of 37 CFR 1.136 nunication. atutory period will will, by statute, of	TE OF THIS COMMUN (a). In no event, however, may a diapply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)  ズ	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 16 Jar	nuary 2007					
_	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)□	,—							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	s)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-11 and 15-19</u> is/are rejected.							
7)🖂	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 12-14</u> is/are objected to.							
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or	election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:			by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim · ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		-	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority			· ·				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
	see the attached detailed Office action	n ior a list o	i the certified copies no	t received.				
Addashiii	M-)							
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)		:مماما □ اه	Summany (PTO 412)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)			Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)  Other:								

Application/Control Number: 10/821,007

Art Unit: 3634

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,4,6,7,9-11,15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 163942 ('942) in view of Dimmit et al.

'942 discloses sliding doors 3,4, that comprise track panels 6,6', and swinging panels 5,5', which define "impact plates". However, the swinging panels are disclosed as being pivoted in only one direction. However, providing a breakaway panel that releases in both directions is well known as illustrated by Dimmit et al, which further provides a detent mechanism, Fig. 9. In view of this teaching it would have been obvious to modify '942 to have the header system of Dimmit et al so as to permit breakaway of the door in both directions.

Regarding claim 10, the mechanism that supports the panels in the tracks also holds the bottom of the panels in a normal position. Claim 11 is met as best understood.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '942 in view of Dimmit et al as applied above, and further in view of Lichy.

Means for maintaining and returning breakaway panels in alignment are common, as illustrated by Lichy, see Figs. 10A,B. It would have been obvious to modify '942 to have such realignment means to automatically realign the panels.

Application/Control Number: 10/821,007

Art Unit: 3634

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '942 in view of Dimmit et al as applied above, and further in view of Lewis Jr. et al.

Polystyrene and fiberglass door panels are old as illustrated by Lewis, column 3, lines 27-29 and such would have been an obvious material for the panels of '942 to provide a tough yet light construction.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '942 in view of Dimmit et al as applied above, and further in view of Clark.

Heating elements to render seals pliable and therefore effective is well known as illustrated by Clark at 19,25, and such would have been an obvious modification of '942 to provide an effective seal.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '942 in view of Dimmit et al as applied above, and further in view of Gregoriou et al.

Leading edge sensors are well known as illustrated by Gregoriou et al and providing such for the panels in '942 would have been obvious to provide a safety feature. When the leading edge is impacted, such could clearly displace the door out of the door plane, thereby satisfying claim 19.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that the doors of the prior art are not intended to be hit by a forklift. However, even if the doors were not designed for the environment that includes a forklift, they clearly are "capable" of being activated by contact with a forklift. '942 and Dimmitt et all are clearly analogous and there is no reason why modifying '942 in view of teachings by Dimmitt et al, including that of a double swinging door, would not be obvious.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blair M. Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-6830. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 6:30-3:00.

Art Unit: 3634

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Cuomo can be reached on (571) 272-6856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Blair M. Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3634

BMJ 3/21/07